



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

S.R.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/311,464 05/13/99 FREILICH

M JPP-1231

┌

QM32/1222

└

EXAMINER

ANN M KNAB
53 NORTH PLAINS INDUSTRIAL ROAD
WALLINGFORD CT 06492

LUCCHESI, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3732

#6

DATE MAILED:
12/22/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/311,464

Applicant(s)
Freilich et al

Examiner
Nick Lucchesi

Group Art Unit
3732



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 33-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-32 and 43-48 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3303

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4,12,16,17,19,26,27,29,30,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carlsson et al.

Carlsson et al disclose an implant system comprising a cylinder 1 having vertical 5 and horizontal 6 shelves thereon. The cylinder is used with impression material to build a framework.

4. Claims 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Branemark.

Art Unit: 3303

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5,6,7-11,13-15,18,20-25,28,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlsson et al.

Although Carlsson et al do not disclose the use of fiber reinforced impression material with the cylinders, to use a fiber reinforced material would have been obvious to one skilled in the art wishing to increase the strength of the impression material, and thus the framework.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Soderberg and Lazzara et al have also been cited to further show the state of the art.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nick Lucchesi whose telephone number is (703) 308-2698.

Nick Lucchesi

December 18, 2000



Nicholas D. Lucchesi
Primary Examiner